

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for kindly indicating that claims 9-19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112. Claims 9-19 have been rewritten substantially as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants now believe that these claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.


Applicants also thank the Examiner for kindly indicating that claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if appropriately rewritten. However, as explained below, Applicants have chosen to cancel all of claims 1-8, including claims 4 and 5.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 6-8 as anticipated by (claims 1-3 and 7-8) or obvious over (claim 6) Muthukrishnan. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the ground that Muthukrishnan fails to teach or suggest, among other things, the steps of "determining a number of sample points between said single commodity flow necessary to satisfy at least one imposed constraint", and "determining a value of commodity flow at each of said sample points". Reference to the Specification, especially at page 5, line 22, to the end of page 6, will make it clear that the "sample points" relate to a mathematical process of constructing an approximate Maximum Flow Frontier (MFF). No such construction is discussed in Muthukrishnan.

However, Applicants currently believe that claims 9-19 more distinctly claim the instant invention. Therefore, Applicants do not request reconsideration of the rejected claims 1-3 and 6-8, but instead have canceled them in the instant amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Gang Liu

By 

Martin I. Finston, Attorney
Reg. No. 31613
908-582-2908.

Date:

July 7, 2005

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030